IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: **Chen**	§	
	§	Group Art Unit: **2174**
Serial No. **10/612,456**	§	
	§	Examiner: **Ke, Peng**
Filed: **July 2, 2003**	§	
	§	
For: **Method and Apparatus for Displaying and Processing Input Fields from a Document**	§	

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

35525
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE
CUSTOMER NUMBER

APPEAL BRIEF (37 C.F.R. 41.37)

This brief is in furtherance of the Notice of Appeal, filed in this case on October 15, 2007.

A fee of $510.00 is required for filing an Appeal Brief. Please charge this fee to IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 09-0447. No additional fees are believed to be necessary. If, however, any additional fees are required, I authorize the Commissioner to charge these fees which may be required to IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 09-0447. No extension of time is believed to be necessary. If, however, an extension of time is required, the extension is requested, and I authorize the Commissioner to charge any fees for this extension to IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 09-0447.

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest in this appeal is the following party: International Business Machines Corporation of Armonk, New York.

RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

With respect to other appeals or interferences that will directly affect, or be directly affected by, or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal, there are no such appeals or interferences.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

A. TOTAL NUMBER OF CLAIMS IN APPLICATION

Claims in the application are: 1-22

B. STATUS OF ALL THE CLAIMS IN APPLICATION

1. Claims canceled: 19;
2. Claims withdrawn from consideration but not canceled: None;
3. Claims pending: 1-18, and 20-22;
4. Claims allowed: None;
5. Claims rejected: 1-18, and 20-22;
6. Claims objected to: None.

C. CLAIMS ON APPEAL

The claims on appeal are: 1-18, 20-22.

STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

No amendments were submitted after the Final Office Action of July 16, 2007.

SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

A. CLAIM 1 - INDEPENDENT

The subject matter of claim 1 is directed to a method in a data processing system for presenting input fields from a document (Specification, p.12, ll. 22-24; p. 13, ll. 14-17; p. 17, ll. 27-28; Figure 4, 408-412; Figure 6, 602). The method includes parsing the document (Specification, p.12, ll. 22-24; p. 13, ll. 14-17; p. 17, ll. 27-28; Figure 4, 408-412; Figure 6, 602) to identify a selected indicator (Specification, p. 13, ll. 17-26) associated with a set of mandatory input fields in the document (Specification, p. 13, ll. 17-26). The method further includes presenting only the set of mandatory input fields (Specification, p. 14, l. 23-p. 15, l. 10).

B. CLAIM 3 - DEPENDENT

The subject matter of claim 5 is directed to a method in a data processing system for presenting input fields from a document. The method includes each claimed feature of the method recited in claim 1. The method further includes the feature of presenting only the set of mandatory input fields wherein the presenting step comprises reformatting the document to contain only the set of mandatory input fields (Specification, p.17, l. 15-p.18, l. 8; Figure 5, 522; Figure 6).

B. CLAIM 5 - DEPENDENT

The subject matter of claim 5 is directed to a method in a data processing system for presenting input fields from a document. The method includes each claimed feature of the method recited in claim 1. The method further includes the feature of identifying a selected indicator, wherein the indicator is a hypertext markup language tag (Specification, p. 13, l. 17-p. 14, l. 5).

GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

The grounds of rejection to review on appeal are as follows:

1. Whether claims 1-4, 7-11, 14, 15-18, 21, and 22 are anticipated by *Easter et al.*, Method and System for Compliance Forms and Compliance Forms User Interface, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0073868 A1 (April 15, 2004) (hereinafter "*Easter*") under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e);

2. Whether claims 5, 6, 12, 13, 19, 20 and 22 are obvious over *Easter* in view of *Philippe* et al., Method and System for Integrating Transaction Mechanisms Over Multiple Internet Sites, U.S. Patent No. 6,882,981 (April 19, 2005) (hereinafter "*Philippe*") under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

ARGUMENT

A. GROUND OF REJECTION 1 (Claims 1-4, 7, 8-11, 14, 15-18, 21, and 22)

The Examiner rejects claims 1-4, 7, 8-11, 14, 15-18, 21, and 22 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by *Easter*. The Appellant requests that the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences overturn this rejection.

A.1. Claim 1

The Examiner rejects claims 1-4, 7, 8-11, 14, 15-18, 21, and 22 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by *Easter*. Claim 1 is representative of the group. Claim 1 is as follows:

> 1. A method in a data processing system for presenting input fields from a document, the method comprising:
>
> parsing the document to identify a selected indicator associated with a set of mandatory input fields in the document and presenting only the set of mandatory input fields.

A prior art reference anticipates the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102 only if every element of a claimed invention is identically shown in that single reference, arranged as they are in the claims. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 832, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566, 1567 (Fed. Cir. 1990). All limitations of the claimed invention must be considered when determining patentability. *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1582, 32 U.S.P.Q.2d 1031, 1034 (Fed. Cir. 1994). Anticipation focuses on whether a claim reads on the product or process a prior art reference discloses, not on what the reference broadly teaches. *Kalman v. Kimberly-Clark Corp.*, 713 F.2d 760, 218 U.S.P.Q. 781 (Fed. Cir.1983). In this case, each and every feature of the presently claimed invention is not identically shown in the cited reference, arranged as they are in the claims.

Easter does not anticipate claim 1 because *Easter* does not teach the claimed feature of, "*parsing the document to identify a selected indicator associated with a set of mandatory input fields* in the document and *presenting only the set of mandatory input fields*," as required in claim 1. Instead, *Easter* discloses interactive and automated forms, and the generation thereof, for use in filling out or otherwise performing functions requiring strict compliance to the forms. Depending on how a user fills out one field entry or section of a form, various other fields of the

form can be presented or remain hidden. The forms and each of the various fields therein are known and interdependent on one another.

With regard to the claim features of "*parsing the document to identify a selected indicator associated with a set of mandatory input fields* in the document and *presenting only the set of mandatory input fields*," the Examiner cites the following section of *Easter*:

> [0124] As shown in **FIG. 54**, within the portion for indicating "what needs to happen" **902**, various options may be selected from, for example, a pulldown menu **910** (for selecting and setting all required fields). In particular, in the example shown, each field's visibility is controlled, each being optional or required based on, for example, values in the fields or additional business logic contained in the condition section, as described further in conjunction with **FIG. 55**.

Easter, paragraph [0124].

A.1.i. *Easter* does not Teach "Parsing the Document"

With regard to the claim features of "*parsing the document to identify a selected indicator associated with a set of mandatory input fields* in the document and *presenting only the set of mandatory input fields*," the Examiner cites the following section of *Easter*:

> [0124] As shown in **FIG. 54**, within the portion for indicating "what needs to happen" **902**, various options may be selected from, for example, a pulldown menu **910** (for selecting and setting all required fields). In particular, in the example shown, each field's visibility is controlled, each being optional or required based on, for example, values in the fields or additional business logic contained in the condition section, as described further in conjunction with **FIG. 55**.

Easter, paragraph [0124].

"Parsing" is a term of art in computer science. Parsing refers to the analyzing of an input sequence (read from a file or a keyboard, for example) in order to determine its grammatical structure with respect to a given formal grammar. Parsing transforms input text into a data structure, usually a tree, which is suitable for later processing and which captures the implied hierarchy of the input. Parsing divides a computer language statement into parts that can be made useful for the computer. Generally, parsing operates in two stages, first identifying the meaningful tokens in the input, and then building a parse tree from those tokens.

Paragraph [0124] of *Easter* describes a process where a user can build a form that

complies with various local and federal regulatory requirements. Specifically, paragraph [0124] describes one logic block within the form building template; paragraph [0124] is basically the "then" component of an "if/then" relationship. A form developer initially enters an initial action to be recorded on the form – this initial action, "define a business rule," is described in paragraph [0123]. Based on the defined business rule, a list of optional or required actions to be taken is presented to the user. The form developer can then choose from the list of optional or required actions and include those actions in a checklist or other presentation of the data within the form. That is, "if" the form developer selects certain options in creating the business rule, "then" various consequences that must or should happen based on that selection are presented to the form developer for inclusion in the form.

Even considering the Examiner's overly broad definition of "parsing," the only activity occurring within the cited paragraph [0124] that could remotely be classified as "parsing" is the stepwise creation of the form, performed by the form developer, not the data processing system. External to any process that may be occurring in the document, the form developer is mentally proceeding stepwise through the described form creation of the form, which could, in an all encompassing theoretical manner that is inconsistent with the specification and the claims, be conceived as a "parse." However, even if the Examiner's characterized activity of paragraph [0124] is a "parse," it occurs external of the data processing system, and would therefore be outside the scope of claim 1. Claim 1 recites "[a] method in a data processing system...." The Examiner's characterized parse-esque activity of paragraph [0124] does not occur in a data processing system, but rather within the mind of the form developer.

Based on a fair reading of the Appellant's specification and claims, the data processing system receiving document information in paragraph [0124] of *Easter* doesn't parse anything. Any parse-esque activity performed by the form developer is done external of any data processing system, and is therefore outside the scope of Appellant's claim 1.

A.1.ii. *Easter* does not Teach "*parsing the document to identify a selected indicator associated with a set of mandatory input fields*"

With regard to the claim features of "*parsing the document to identify a selected indicator associated with a set of mandatory input fields* in the document and *presenting only the*

set of mandatory input fields," the Examiner cites the following section of *Easter*:

> [0124] As shown in **FIG. 54**, within the portion for indicating "what needs to happen" **902**, various options may be selected from, for example, a pulldown menu **910** (for selecting and setting all required fields). In particular, in the example shown, each field's visibility is controlled, each being optional or required based on, for example, values in the fields or additional business logic contained in the condition section, as described further in conjunction with **FIG. 55**.

Easter, paragraph [0124].

Even if the activities in paragraph [0124] are somehow characterized as a "parse," a characterization which the Appellant disagrees with and has shown to be incorrect above, characterized parse activity does not disclose "*parsing the document to identify a selected indicator associated with a set of mandatory input fields.*"

The Examiner has failed to explain how any parsing activity identifies a "selected indicator," as required by Appellant's claim 1. The Examiner cites no feature in paragraph [0124] that would be comparable to the Appellant's "selected indicator" feature. Furthermore, the Examiner has failed to associate the non-identified "selected indicator" feature with any "mandatory input fields."

A.1.iii. *Easter* Does Not Teach "*presenting only the set of mandatory input fields*"

With regard to this feature, the Examiner again cites paragraph [0124] and makes the following assertion:

> Since each field's visibility is controlled, the users can set non-mandatory fields to invisible

Final Office Action dated July 16, 2007, page 2.

First, the Examiner's assumption that the "users can set non-mandatory fields to invisible" is completely unsupported by any disclosure in *Easter*. Cited paragraph [0124] never mentions a visibility setting of "invisible." Likewise, Figures 54 and 55 referred to in paragraph [0124] also fail to disclose a visibility setting of "invisible." Instead, these figures refer to settings, such as "required" or "optional," which would conceivably change the color of an associated input prompt – based on *Easter*'s paragraph [0117].

Figure 54 shows a "visible" input for one field. However, Figure 54 does not show an

"invisible" input as implied by the Examiner. The Examiner therefore seems to imply that an "invisible" input is therefore inherent to every "visible" input. Due to the complete lack of corresponding disclosure in *Easter*, such an assertion would never survive an inherency analysis. The Examiner has failed to cite any disclosure in *Easter* that "users can set non-mandatory fields to invisible"

Second, there is no disclosure in *Easter* indicating that "only the set of mandatory input fields" is presented. Again, the Examiner's cited paragraph [0124] of *Easter* never mentions a visibility setting of "invisible." Likewise, Figures 54 and 55 referred to in paragraph [0124] also fail to disclose a visibility setting of "invisible." Even then, the Examiner's cited paragraph [0124] never mentions that "only the set of mandatory input fields" is presented.

A.2. Claim 3

Claim 3 is as follows:

> 3. The method of claim 1, wherein the presenting step comprises: reformatting the document to contain only the set of mandatory input fields.

Easter does not anticipate claim 1 because *Easter* does not teach the claimed feature of "reformatting the document to contain only the set of mandatory input fields," as required in claim 3. In support of the rejection, the Examiner again cites the same paragraph [0124] relied upon for the previous rejection.

> [0124] As shown in **FIG. 54**, within the portion for indicating "what needs to happen" **902**, various options may be selected from, for example, a pulldown menu **910** (for selecting and setting all required fields). In particular, in the example shown, each field's visibility is controlled, each being optional or required based on, for example, values in the fields or additional business logic contained in the condition section, as described further in conjunction with **FIG. 55**.

Easter, paragraph [0124].

Arguments with respect to presenting only those mandatory fields were presented in section **A.1.iii** above. Such comments are equally applicable to the current rejection.

Furthermore, *Easter* does not teach "*reformatting* the document to contain only the set of mandatory input fields." Paragraph [0124] of *Easter* describes a process where

a user can build a form that complies with various local and federal regulatory requirements. Specifically, paragraph [0124] describes one logic block within the form building template, and it is basically the "then" component of an "if/then" relationship. A form developer initially enters an initial action to be recorded on the form – this initial action, "define a business rule," is described in paragraph [0123]. Based on the defined business rule, a list of optional or required actions to be taken is presented to the user. The form developer can then choose from the list of optional or required actions and include those actions in a checklist or other presentation of the data within the form. That is, "if" the form developer selects certain options in creating the business rule, "then" various consequences that must or should happen based on that selection are presented to the form developer for inclusion in the form.

Because a user is building an initial form, the user is building an initial format into the document. As stated in paragraph [0042] of *Easter*, the document contains both "required" and "optional" input fields, which would conceivably change the color of an associated input prompt. Paragraph [0124] does not disclose reformatting the document to exclude any of the "optional" fields. Rather, paragraph [0124] refers to the initial build of a form by a form developer and not the reformatting on an associated form.

B. GROUND OF REJECTION 2 (Claims 5, 6, 12, 13, 19 and 20)

The Examiner rejects claims 5, 6, 12, 13, 19, 20 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over *Easter* in view of *Philippe* et al., Method and System for Integrating Transaction Mechanisms Over Multiple Internet Sites, U.S. Patent No. 6,882,981 (April 19, 2005) (hereinafter "*Philippe*"). Appellant requests that the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences overturn this rejection.

B1. Claim 5

The Examiner rejects claims 5, 6, 12, 13, 19, 20 and 22 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by *Easter*. Claim 5 is representative of the group. Claim 5 is as follows:

> 5. The method of claim 1, wherein the indicator is a hypertext markup language tag.

The Examiner bears the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness based on prior art when rejecting claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103. *In re Fritch*, 972 F.2d 1260, 23 U.S.P.Q.2d 1780 (Fed. Cir. 1992). The prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *In re Royka,* 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). In determining obviousness, the scope and content of the prior art are... determined; differences between the prior art and the claims at issue are... ascertained; and the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art resolved. Against this background the obviousness or non-obviousness of the subject matter is determined. *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1 (1966). "Often, it will be necessary for a court to look to interrelated teachings of multiple patents; the effects of demands known to the design community or present in the marketplace; and the background knowledge possessed by a person having ordinary skill in the art, all in order to determine whether there was an apparent reason to combine the known elements in the fashion claimed by the patent at issue." *KSR Int'l. Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, No. 04-1350 (U.S. Apr. 30, 2007). "*Rejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness.* Id. (citing *In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d 977, 988 (CA Fed. 2006))."

B.1.i. The Proposed Combination Fails to Teach All of the Features of the Dependent Claims at Least by Virtue of their Dependence on the Independent Claims

The obviousness rejections are predicated upon the assertions made with respect to *Easter*. As shown above, the underlying assertions made by the Examiner regarding *Easter*'s disclosure are incorrect vis-à-vis the independent claims. Specifically, *Easter* does not disclose the feature of "parsing the document to identify a selected indicator associated with a set of mandatory input fields in the document and presenting only the set of mandatory input fields," as recited in the independent claims. For this reason, *Easter* does not disclose, either explicitly or implicitly, all of the features of claims 5, 6, 12, 13, 19, 20 and 22, at least by virtue of their dependence on the independent claims.

Additionally, *Philippe* does not teach or suggest the feature of, "parsing the document to identify a selected indicator associated with a set of mandatory input fields in the document and presenting only the set of mandatory input fields." The Examiner does not assert otherwise.

Instead, *Philippe* discloses

> [A] method for interacting with multiple web sites in order to effect commercial transactions on the web. Systems according to the present invention enable online shoppers to make selections and purchase products from a plurality of vendor sources using a common interface program.

Philippe, col. 3, ll. 25-30.

Philippe is wholly unrelated to the inventions of the independent claims and, accordingly, is wholly unrelated to claims 5, 6, 12, 13, 19, 20 and 22. Therefore, *Philippe* is devoid of disclosure regarding the feature the Examiner asserts to be found in *Easter*.

As shown above, neither *Easter* nor *Philippe* teach or suggest all of the features of claims 5, 6, 12, 13, 19, 20 and 22, at least by virtue of their dependency on the corresponding independent claims. Therefore, the proposed combination of these references when considered together as a whole does not disclose all of the features of claims 5, 6, 12, 13, 19, 20 and 22. For this reason, the Examiner has failed to state a *prima facie* obviousness rejection against these claims.

B.1.ii. *Philippe* does not teach that "the indicator is a hypertext markup language tag"

With regard to the claim features of "wherein the indicator is a hypertext markup language tag" the Examiner cites the following section of *Philippe*:

> FIG. 1B is a functional diagram of the computer system of FIG. 1A. FIG. 1B depicts a server 20, and a representative client 25 of a multiplicity of clients which may interact with the server 20 via the internet 45 or any other communications method. Blocks to the right of the server are indicative of the processing components and functions which occur in the server's program and data storage indicated by block 35a in FIG. 1A. A TCP/IP "stack" 44 works in conjunction with Operating System 42 to communicate with processes over a network or serial connection attaching Server 20 to internet 45. Web server software 46 executes concurrently and cooperatively with other processes in server 20 to make data objects 50 and 51 available to requesting clients. A Common Gateway Interface (CGI) script 55 enables information from user clients to be acted upon by web server 46, or other processes within server 20. Responses to client queries may be returned to the clients in the form of a Hypertext Markup Language (HTML) document outputs which are then communicated via internet 45 back to the user.

> Client 25 in FIG. 1B possesses software implementing functional processes operatively disposed in its program and data storage as indicated by block 35a' in FIG. 1A. TCP/IP stack 44', works in conjunction with Operating System 42' to communicate with processes over a network or serial connection attaching Client 25 to internet 45. Software implementing the function of a web browser 46' executes concurrently and cooperatively with other processes in client 25 to make requests of server 20 for data objects 50 and 51. The user of the client may interact via the web browser 46' to make such queries of the server 20 via internet 45 and to view responses from the server 20 via internet 45 on the web browser 46'.

Philippe, col. 5 ll. 20-50.

The cited section of *Philippe* discloses a computer system wherein a client can interact with a server via the internet by submitting queries to the server. Responses to client queries may be returned to the clients in the form of a Hypertext Markup Language (HTML) document outputs which are then communicated via internet 45 back to the user.

The cited section states nothing regarding an HTML tag being used as an indicator. Rather the cited section merely states that a response in the form of an HTML document is returned to the user. This teaching is not surprising, seeing that Philippe provides this document to the user in the form of a web page. However, merely providing an HTML document does not obviate the rejected features of claim 5, namely that "the indicator is a hypertext markup language tag."

As shown above and contrary to the Examiner's assertion, *Philippe* does not disclose the feature of claim 5 "wherein the indicator is a hypertext markup language tag." Therefore, the proposed combination of these references, when considered together as a whole, does not disclose all of the features of claim 5. For this reason, the Examiner has failed to state a *prima facie* obviousness rejection against claim 5.

B.1.iii. No Proper Reason Exists to Combine the References in a Manner that Compels the Legal Conclusion that Claim 1 Is Obvious in View of the References

Additionally, no proper reason exists to combine the references in a manner that compels the legal conclusion that claim 1 is obvious in view of the references. No proper reason to combine the references exists because the references are completely different from each other.

For example, *Easter* discloses interactive and automated forms, and the generation thereof, for use in filling out or otherwise performing functions requiring strict compliance to the forms. Depending on how a user fills out one field entry or section of a form, various other fields of the form can be presented or remain hidden. The forms and each of the various fields therein are known and interdependent on one another. In stark contrast, *Phillipe* is directed to a completely different method for interacting with multiple web sites in order to effect commercial transactions on the web. Systems according to *Phillipe* enable online shoppers to make selections and purchase products from a plurality of vendor sources using a common interface program. Thus, *Easter* has nothing to do with *Phillipe*, except insomuch as both use a data processing system for implementation.

Because the references have nothing to do with each other, one of ordinary skill could find no reason to combine the references to achieve the invention of claim 1, when the references are considered together as a whole. More importantly, the vast disparities among the references show that one of ordinary skill *could not establish a rational reason to combine the references in a manner that compels the conclusion that claim 1 is obvious* in view of the references considered together as a whole. Accordingly, under the standards of *KSR Int'l.*, the Examiner failed to state a *prima facie* obviousness rejection against claim 1.

CONCLUSION

As shown above, the Examiner has failed to state a *prima facie* obviousness rejection against any of the claims. Therefore, Appellants request that the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences reverse the rejections. Additionally, Appellants request that the Board direct the Examiner to allow the claims

/Brandon G. Williams/
Brandon G. Williams
Reg. No. 48,844
YEE & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
PO Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777

BW

CLAIMS APPENDIX

The text of the claims involved in the appeal are:

1. A method in a data processing system for presenting input fields from a document, the method comprising:

parsing the document to identify a selected indicator associated with a set of mandatory input fields in the document and presenting only the set of mandatory input fields.

2. The method of claim 1, wherein the presenting step comprises:

displaying the set of mandatory input fields in a window.

3. The method of claim 1, wherein the presenting step comprises:

reformatting the document to contain only the set of mandatory input fields.

4. The method of claim 1, wherein the presenting step comprises:

presenting a first input field from the set of mandatory input fields; and

responsive to information being entered in the first input field, presenting a second input field from the set of mandatory input fields.

5. The method of claim 1, wherein the indicator is a hypertext markup language tag.

6. The method of claim 1, wherein the document is a Web page.

7. The method of claim 1 further comprising:

determining whether any of the set of mandatory input fields correspond to pre-stored information; and

responsive to an input field within the set of mandatory input fields corresponding to pre-stored information, filling the input field within the set of mandatory input fields with the pre-stored information.

8. A data processing system for presenting input fields from a document, the data processing system comprising:

identifying means for identifying a selected indicator within a parsed document, the indictor being associated with a set of mandatory input fields in the document; and

presenting means for presenting only the set of mandatory input fields,

9. The data processing system of claim 8, wherein the presenting means comprises:

displaying means for displaying the set of mandatory input fields in a window.

10. The data processing system of claim 8, wherein the presenting means comprises:

reformatting means for reformatting the document to contain only the set of mandatory input fields.

11. The data processing system of claim 8, wherein the presenting means comprises:

first means for presenting a first input field from the set of mandatory input fields; and

second means for presenting a second input field from the set of mandatory input fields in response to information being entered in the first input field.

12. The data processing system of claim 8, wherein the indicator is a hypertext markup language tag.

13. The data processing system of claim 8, wherein the document is a Web page.

14. The data processing system of claim 8 further comprising:

determining means for determining whether any of the set of mandatory input fields correspond to pre-stored information; and

filling means for filling an input field within the set of mandatory input fields with the pre-stored information in response to the input field within the set of mandatory input fields corresponding to the pre-stored information.

15. A computer program product in a recordable-type medium for presenting input fields from a document, the computer program product comprising:

first instructions for parsing the document to identify a selected indicator associated with a set of mandatory input fields in the document; and

second instructions for presenting only the set of mandatory input fields.

16. The computer program product of claim 15, wherein the second instructions comprises:

sub-instructions for displaying the set of mandatory input fields in a window.

17. The computer program product of claim 15, wherein the second instructions comprises:

sub-instructions for reformatting the document to contain only the set of mandatory input

fields.

18. The computer program product of claim 15, wherein the second instructions comprises:

first sub-instructions for presenting a first input field from the set of mandatory input fields; and

second sub-instructions for presenting a second input field from the set of mandatory input fields in response to information being entered in the first input field.

20. The computer program product of claim 15, wherein the document is a Web page.

21. The computer program product of claim 15 further comprising:

seventh instructions for determining whether any of the set of mandatory input fields correspond to pre-stored information; and

eighth instructions for filling an input field within the set of mandatory input fields corresponding to pre-stored information with the pre-stored information in response to the input field within the set of mandatory input fields corresponding to the pre-stored information.

22. A server data processing for obtaining cultural context information from a client, the server data processing system comprising:

a bus system;

a communications unit connected to the bus system;

a memory connected to the bus system, wherein the memory includes a set of instructions; and

a processing unit connected to the bus system, wherein the processing unit identifies a selected indicator associated with a set of mandatory input fields in the document and presents only the set of mandatory input fields, wherein the indicator is a hypertext markup language tag.

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

There is no evidence to be presented.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

There are no related proceedings.